

January 13, 2004

Ms. Leslie R. Sweet Legal Advisor Dallas County 133 N. Industrial Blvd., LB 31 Dallas, Texas 75207-4313

OR2004-0268

Dear Ms. Sweet:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 194644.

The Dallas County Sheriff's Department (the "department") received a request for any resignation, disciplinary, or termination records related to a named officer. You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.102 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note that the department has not sought an open records decision from this office within ten business days as prescribed by section 552.301. See Gov't Code § 552.301. Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the requested information is public and must be released unless the governmental body demonstrates a compelling reason to withhold the information from disclosure. See Gov't Code § 552.302; Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins., 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ) (governmental body must make compelling demonstration to overcome presumption of openness pursuant to statutory predecessor to section 552.302); Open Records Decision No. 319 (1982). Normally, a compelling reason for non-disclosure exists where some other source of law makes the information confidential or where third party interests are at stake. Open Records Decision No. 150 at 2 (1977). Thus, we will address your argument under section 552.102 of the Government Code.

Section 552.102(a) of the Government Code protects "information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy." The test for determining whether information is excepted under section 552.102 is the same

as the one used to decide whether it is protected by the common-law right to privacy under section 552.101. Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Tex. Newspapers, 652 S.W.2d 546 (Tex. App.—Austin 1983, writ ref'd n.r.e.).

Information is protected under the common-law right to privacy when (1) the information contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) the information is not of legitimate concern to the public. See Industrial Found. v. Texas Indus. Accident Bd., 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976), cert. denied, 430 U.S. 931 (1977). This office has found that the following types of information are excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy: some kinds of medical information or information indicating disabilities or specific illnesses, see Open Records Decision Nos. 470 (1987) (illness from severe emotional and job-related stress), 455 (1987) (prescription drugs, illnesses, operations, and physical handicaps), personal financial information not relating to the financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body, see Open Records Decision Nos. 545 (1990), 523 (1989) (individual's mortgage payments, assets, bills, and credit history), certain personal choices relating to financial transactions between the individual and the governmental body, see Open Records Decision No. 600 (1992) (designation of beneficiary of employee's retirement benefits and optional insurance coverage; choice of particular insurance carrier; direct deposit authorization; and forms allowing employee to allocate pretax compensation to group insurance, health care, or dependent care), information concerning the intimate relations between individuals and their family members, see Open Records Decision No. 470 (1987), and identities of victims of sexual abuse, see Open Records Decision Nos. 440 (1986), 393 (1983), 339 (1982). Having reviewed the submitted information, we conclude that the submitted information consists solely of information regarding the employment of the individual in question and, thus, is of legitimate concern to the public. See Open Records Decision Nos. 470 (1987) (public employee's job performance does not generally constitute his private affairs), 455 (1987) (public employee's job performances or abilities generally not protected by privacy), 444 (1986) (public has legitimate interest in knowing reasons for dismissal, demotion, promotion, or resignation of public employees). Therefore, the submitted information is not confidential under common-law privacy and may not be withheld under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code.

However, section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code excepts from required public disclosure the home address, home telephone number, social security number, and the family member information of a peace officer as defined by article 2.12 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. See Open Records Decision No. 622 (1994). We have marked the information that must be withheld under section 552.117(a)(2).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." This section encompasses the common-law right to privacy.

Additionally, section 552.130 of the Government Code prohibits the release of information that relates to a motor vehicle operator's or driver's license or permit issued by an agency of this state or a motor vehicle title or registration issued by an agency of this state. See Gov't Code § 552.130. Accordingly, the department must withhold the Texas driver's license and license plate information we have marked pursuant to section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, we conclude that the department must withhold the section 552.117(a)(2) and 552.130 information. All remaining information must be released.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,

V. Martymeny Math

W. Montgomery Meitler Assistant Attorney General Open Records Division

WMM/Imt

Ref: ID# 194644

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Ms. Lisa Mullen
Mullen & Whitaker
One Summit Avenue, Suite 906
Fort Worth, Texas 76102
(w/o enclosures)